Hushed Up By The Press: Ike's Naivete on Guatemala—Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. 2, NUMBER 23 JUNE 28, 1954 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Made To Order (By Brownell) For McCarthy

Capitol Hill—There were no television cameras in Room 346 Old House Office Building last Wednesday morning. When the hearing began, a member of the House Judiciary Committee, Walter (D., Pa.) scolded the witness for giving out his testimony to the press in advance. The Congressman might have saved himself the trouble if he had noticed that while the statement was on the press table, there were only one or two reporters present to receive it. The almost empty hearing room in which Russell Nixon, legislative representative of the United Electrical Workers of America (UE) addressed himself to HJ Res. 527 and 528 was in stark and eloquent contrast to that other hearing room where the Senator from Wisconsin had starred. That the chamber should have been so empty testified to how little the McCarthy hearings had educated the public and the President. For these two bills, framed by Attorney General Brownell, were made to order for McCarthy.

To understand their full meaning, imagine an America in which McCarthy has come to power. Imagine McCarthy intent on preserving a facade of legality. Imagine that these two Brownell bills have become law. It would then be within McCarthy's power legally under HJ Res. 528 to put a special receiver in charge of their businesses and organizations, to seize their financial assets and to liquidate them. He would also be able (under HJ Res. 527) to set up a blacklist which would bar opponents from employment almost anywhere in American industry under penalty of $10,000 fine or 5 years in jail.

To read these two Brownell bills in the light of McCarthy's record—and indeed the Attorney General's readiness to impute treason to the Democratic opposition—is to see what power for evil they would give the unscrupulous. Under HJ Res. 528, the Attorney General could go before the Subversive Activities Control Board and move to liquidate any private business, trade union or other organization which he believes has been "infiltrated" by members of "Communist action" organizations.

It would not be necessary to show domination and control. The standard would be "the extent to which" the positions taken by the organization "do not deviate from those of" Communists and "the extent to which" the organization or business was "in a position to impair the effective mobilization or use of economic resources or manpower" for defense. The use to which such vague standards could be put by a McCarthy should not be difficult to imagine.

Under HJ Res. 527, any time a President "finds . . . that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of . . . subversive activity . . . or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States" he may bar from employment in "defense facilities" (as broadly defined to cover virtually all civilian industry) any "individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe that they may engage in sabotage, espionage, *or other subversive acts.*"

This is crystal ball legislation; it requires a determination of prospective future guilt. While a hearing would be accorded, nothing would be "deemed to require any investigatory organization of the U. S. Government to disclose its informants or other information which would endanger its investigatory activity." Hearings would be held in the dark.

These are the key bills of the security program Eisenhower in his broadcast of June 10 termed "protection against Communism, without any degree damaging or lessening the rights of the individual citizen as guaranteed by our laws and the Constitution." It is difficult to describe such a characterization politely. Ferguson (R., Mich.), who introduced the bills in the Senate, spoke more honestly when he said of them in a speech on June 17 that they went "contrary to our nature and traditions. . . We are groping along paths unaccustomed to most Americans." These are in sober fact the paths toward Fascism.

The silence and apathy which surround the effort to rush these bills through Congress should dispel any easy illusions about the therapeutic effect of the McCarthy circus. The *Wall Street Journal* (June 1), the Louisville *Courier-Journal* (May 12), and the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* (May 20) have been critical, but most papers, organizations and trade unions are afraid to oppose anything which comes wrapped as anti-Communism. There is danger of what Nixon in his able testimony* called a "sneak blitz".

The UE has Paul Revered enough pressure to get the House hearings extended. Congressmen Eberharter (D., Pa.) and Condon (D., Cal.) will testify against the bills. In the Senate, where Langer (R., S. Dak.), chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is opposed to the bills, a similar measure (McCarran's S. 23) was reported out by a ruse and called up on the consent calendar last week by the majority leader, Knowland (Cal.). Objections by Gore (D., Tenn.), Morse (Ind., Ore.), Hendrickson (R., N. J.), Lehman (D., N. Y.) and Magnuson (D., Wash.) blocked passage. No hearings have been held in the Senate; Brownell has not testified on his bills. Everyone who has learned anything from those McCarthy hearings should do their bit to rally protest. This is urgent.

* Copies of it and the appended legal memoranda may be obtained as ammunition from the UE national office, 11 E. 51 St., New York 22.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Story The Newspapers Suppressed

Hushing Up Ike's Honest Naivete On Guatemala?

United Nations, N. Y.—Though anything about the President is news, not a single newspaper seems to have reported the extraordinary story told about Eisenhower by the Guatemalan representative at the special session of the UN Security Council last Sunday.

According to this story, the President last January proposed the formation of a joint commission to take up disputes between the U.S. and Guatemala. When informed of the role played by United Fruit and of the relations between the company and Secretary of State Dulles and then Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs John M. Cabot, Eisenhower suggested these two officials be left off the commission!

Here is the story, as told by the Guatemalan delegate, Castillo-Arriola, to the Security Council:

"Mr. Toriello Garrido, Guatemalan Ambassador in Washington, had a farewell interview of several minutes with President Eisenhower [last January IFS]. It is interesting to note that in those few moments President Eisenhower knew nothing about, or had entirely different information on, the state of the United Fruit Company's business in my country.

"The former Guatemalan Ambassador [now Foreign Minister] informed him fully of the manner in which the United Fruit Company and other U.S. monopolies had been operating in Guatemala, with full control over all our ports and communications and in occupation of vast tracts of territory, with Guatemala's national economy virtually subject to their interests.

"President Eisenhower told Ambassador Toriello that that situation could not continue in the same form and that it would be necessary to come to an arrangement. Mr. Toriello then informed President Eisenhower of the implications of the fact that both Mr. John M. Cabot, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs and Mr. Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, himself had close connections with the fruit monopoly.

"In view of that situation, President Eisenhower suggested the formation of a joint commission which would not include those officers, to study the problem and work out just solutions."

As pointed out in the last issue of the *Weekly*, Mr. Cabot's family is a major interest in the United Fruit Company Bank, First National of Boston, and Mr. Dulles's law firm, Sullivan & Cromwell, represents the United Fruit railroad, International Railways of Central America.

Cabot Transferred to Sweden

On February 11, a few weeks after this reported conversation at the White House, Mr. Cabot was appointed Ambassador to Sweden. Henry Cabot Lodge, the U.S. representative at the Security Council, in his rejoinder to the Guatemalan delegate, made no reference to the story of this interview at the White House.

The press also passed over the charges made by the Guatemalan delegate to the Council against a former U.S. Ambassador and Mr. Lodge's answer to those charges.

The delegate said Richard Patterson, the former U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala, "announced openly that the Government then headed by Dr. Juan José Arevalo [Arbenz's predecessor] would be overthrown as the result of international pressure; incited various groups of conspirators to engage in subversive activities against the constitutional regime and expressed to high officials of the Guatemalan government the opinion that the Guatemalan problem was a matter which could easily be settled, as it represented a just claim and involved only a few million dollars, but that, if the United States were to give way in the case of Guatemala, it would be obliged to do so elsewhere, which would mean a loss of many thousand million dollars."

Just One of Those Democrats

Mr. Lodge's reply to this was, "Mr. Patterson does not hold office under this administration; he has never held office under this administration." The U.S. delegate also did not reply directly to the charge that operations against the Guatemalan government were directed by the former chief of the U.S. Military Aviation Mission to Guatemala, who asked for his discharge from the U.S. Army in 1952 "and then came to live and work in Guatemala."

Mr. Lodge (and the press) also passed over the Guatemalan's reply to Secretary Dulles' statement of June 8, "If the United Fruit matter were settled, if they gave a gold piece for every banana, the problem would remain just as it is today as far as the presence of communist infiltration in Guatemala is concerned."

"Mr. Dulles did not consider," the Guatemalan delegate told the Security Council, "that there is a reverse side to this medal. I could tell him—and tell him truthfully— that if tomorrow the Communist party (which has a following in Guatemala because Guatemala is a free country which allows freedom of thought) were to be outlawed by the Guatemalan government and all its members deported, a new pretext would be found for the campaign. For the purpose is to aid the monopolies . . . which have lost their sources of exploitation by Guatemala's exercise of its sovereign rights . . . The agrarian reform, for instance, is a piece of legislation which has been introduced in my country quite legitimately and in according with the principles of the United Nations."

Indo-China and Guatemala

The press also ignored the part played by the Indo-Chinese crisis in the Security Council session on Guatemala. The delegates from Honduras, Nicaragua, Brazil and Colombia "ran interference" (as they say in football) for U.S. policy, with a resolution referring the Guatemalan complaint to the Organization of American States.

The French delegate upset the U.S. plans. M. Hoppenot rose to recall the words used by Mr. Lodge two days earlier in bringing the Thai request for intervention in Indo China before the Security Council against the wishes of France. This was the French way of retaliating.

"The United States was a small country for a long time," M. Hoppenot quoted Mr. Lodge as saying, "and still looks at many things from the standpoint of a small country. I hope that I will never live to see the day when a small country comes to the United Nations and asks for protection against war and is simply greeted with the question: What is the hurry?"

M. Hoppenot thereupon amended the resolution to call for a cease-fire and asked for a separate vote on the amendment. When the sponsors insisted that the resolution be accepted or rejected as a whole, it was vetoed by the Soviet Union.

M. Hoppenot then offered the cease-fire resolution as a substitute and it was unanimously adopted. Mr. Lodge sarcastically disparaged the importance of the cease-fire resolution at the close of the session and said sourly, "I commend the representative of France for having been able to find the lowest common denominator."

The French were opposed to the Thai request for a peace observation mission as a step toward internationalization of the Indo-Chinese war. The cease-fire resolution they sponsored made unanimous action possible, instead of leaving the Soviet Union in the position of "blocking peace" by a veto. The cease-fire also left the door open to a new appeal by Guatemala to the Security Council. The Latin American Republic had asked for an observation mission. The U.S. favored such a mission for Thailand but not for Guatemala.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nobody Seems to Like John Foster Dulles

Round The Capitol And The Globe

"Massive Retaliation"—Against Little Guatemala: John Foster Dulles's "banana war" against Guatemala is liable to end with the overthrow of Dulles as Secretary of State. The repercussions throughout Latin America are unfavorable to the U.S. The hypocrisy of the State Department was never more transparent than in its appeals at the United Nations to keep the Guatemalan dispute "within the family." The Guatemalan delegate to the UN behaved with great dignity and spoke with impressive restraint at last Sunday's session. The rebels are not taken seriously; there is little likelihood that they can succeed without an Army coup d'etat inside Guatemala and that does not seem to be in the United Fruit Company's cards. The war itself, on the heels of our demand to search ships on the high seas, left an unpleasant impression on public opinion in friendly Western nations, the impression of a clumsy and arrogant diplomacy, prepared to change the rules at our convenience, even rules for which the U.S. has itself fought long and hard—like freedom of the seas. Respect for Dulles was never lower.

The New Mendes-France Government: The French Embassy here blames Dulles for the fall of the Laniel government and Bidault's loss of the Foreign Ministry. The Embassy feels there was no need for Dulles suddenly to make so brutally plain that the U.S. was no longer interested in Indo-China, thus destroying Bidault's bargaining power at Geneva and Paris. The fact is, however, that a subtle game was going on. Bidault did not want American intervention; he wanted American *threats* to intervene which would strengthen his own hand in negotiating a peace which would maintain French position in Indo-China. Dulles understood this. He was not interested in making it possible for Bidault to make as good a peace settlement as possible. Dulles was anxious to keep the war going, to take over the Associated States from France if necessary and to create another South Korea in Indo-China. When it became clear that Bidault did not share these objectives, Dulles dumped him. The realization of this helped Mendes-France with the French right. Bidault's fall has ended the Catholic MRP monopoly of the French Foreign Office since the war, and with it may have ended an era in American relations with Western Europe which were based on a "Little Catholic" Europe.

Behind the Churchill Visit: Another sector in which trouble is brewing for Dulles is in Anglo-American relations. Neither Churchill nor Dulles like Eden and a main purpose of the visit is to establish direct contact with Eisenhower. Churchill's ties with Eisenhower are old and close and the State Department crowd does not relish being short-circuited by the Prime Minister. The fear is that Churchill is coming in an effort to sell the President the idea that China can be weaned away from a too close dependence on Russia if doors to the West begin to open, first in a relaxation of trade restrictions, then (when public opinion has been prepared) in recognition.

Eccles for Recognizing Red China: The British still do not seem to realize how powerful is the hold of the China Lobby on American politics. The only national figure in many months who has dared suggest recognition of Red China is Marriner S. Eccles, former chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. "Nothing is solved," he told the National Association of University Presidents in a speech last May 3, "by our denial of the fact that the Communist Government is the Government of China. In fact our attitude toward China only serves to weld the Communist world more closely together. A solution of the involved problems of Korea and Indochina, which so directly affect Red China and the free world . . . will not be hastened by Mr. Dulles' refusal to either speak or look at Mr. Chou En-lai, Red China's premier, as recently reported by the United Press."

7

Frankness on Capitol Hill

Washington—For the second year in a row, the House Republican leadership has rejected an Eisenhower request for a small appropriation ($185,000 asked for the 1954 budget, $100,000 for the 1955 budget) to establish a Federal-State program to help migratory labor. The Labor, Health, Education and Welfare appropriations bill did include a $1,500,000 Mexican farm labor program.

Van Zandt (R. Pa.) on June 9 tried unsuccessfully to amend the bill to provide the $100,000 asked for Eisenhower, saying that the welfare of a million American migratory farm families was at stake. O'Konski (R. Wis.) supported him, pointing out that the bill contained 15 times as much "for Mexican migratory workers as for American migratory workers." This brought an unusually frank reply from Busbey (R. Ill.), the chairman of the subcommittee which was in charge of this portion of the appropriations bill.

Busbey said "the money that is appropriated in this bill for the Mexican farm labor program is not appropriated for the benefit of Mexican labor. It is appropriated to recruit Mexican labor for the farmers who need this stoop-back labor in this country and cannot get it any place else. The crops could not be harvested unless we appropriated this money to recruit that Mexican farm labor."

Maury Maverick on Dienbienphu: Among those in Congress and out who had a good word to say in death for former Congressman Maury Maverick, none mentioned one of his last public statements. In this, Maverick took issue with Senator Knowland, who had likened the defenders of Dienbienphu to the defenders of the Alamo. Maury, outspoken and warm-hearted to the last in his sympathy for the underdog, told the *San Antonio Light* (May 9) that this was an insult to the Texans. "The defenders of the Alamo," Maury said, "were free men fighting for liberty. The defenders of Dienbienphu were all mercenaries, fighting for French colonialism. They were defending the most disgraceful and corrupt administration in Asia." This was worthy of Maury, who led the first mixed delegation in history from Texas to a Democratic national convention in 1952. We salute his passing, and send our warmest sympathy to his family. Maury Maverick was the kind of man the name American once denoted.

Right of Asylum in Britain: It is hardly a secret among Left intellectuals that a whole generation of American refugees is beginning to grow up abroad as repression increases at home. It is thus of interest to note the wide support in the British press given to Dr. Cort, an American lecturing at the University of Birmingham, who has appealed for asylum in England after his passport was lifted by the Embassy in London. The ever generous *New Statesman and Nation* came to Dr. Cort's defense with a long leader in its issue of June 19. More surprisingly, the London *Times* in a leader on the same date also expressed sympathy. "The existence of close and friendly relations with a foreign state," the *Times* said, "is, in principle, no reason for refusing political asylum to its subjects. There can be no geographical boundary or bias upon this boon." It was England's glory in the Nineteenth century to shelter exiles from older forms of despotism, and in the Twentith Century to give a home to those fleeing oppression in the Fascist States and in the Soviet bloc. We hope the same principle will be upheld in the case of refugees from the brand of Fascism developing in America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Debate Which May Have Killed The Wiretap Bill

A Southern Democrat Warns Against Thought Control

On June 11, Morse (Ind. Ore.) rose in the Senate to deliver the second in a series of address he has been giving against wiretapping. The surprise was the speech which followed from Johnston of South Carolina, a ranking member of the Judiciary committee and one of the conservative Southern Democrats who wield so much power in the Senate. Though little attention was paid by the press to what was said, this debate seems to have ended Attorney General Brownell's hope of getting legislation permitting the FBI legally to tap wires.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As a member of the subcommittee which is holding hearings on the bills relating to wire-tapping, I have become very much interested in this question. My convictions are deep-seated. Whatever proposals of a permissive nature may come from the Judiciary Committee as a result of its consideration of the several measures before it, it will not meet with my approval. I am against them one and all. Every one of them does violence to my concept of the democratic way of life. . .

We shall be asked to support a measure permitting our every expressed thought to become public property. Make no mistake about that. Look out for the day when mechanical mind-readers shall be employed to search for and reveal our contained thoughts. The proposals in these measures are only entering wedges. Later on we must amend and amend and amend. When amendments are over, total surrender of all our rights will have been accomplished. . . .

This proposed legislation gives every government official under the Attorney General a license to become a peeping tom. . . . He will take his ill-gained knowledge and with it the remains of every remnant of a priceless inheritance under our Bill of Rights. No threat, peril, nor imminent national disaster appear on our horizon which would justify this kind of sacrifice on our part. . . .

I do not know whether the Senator has ever seen an FBI report or not, but I think it would awaken many people in the United States if they knew just how the FBI obtains records, and how it goes about wiretapping at the present time. I think it should be prevented from wiretapping. . .

Mr. WELKER. I certainly agree with the Senator in his conclusion that all private wiretapping should be eliminated. However when our country is in danger, and espionage agents are working day and night, it seems to me that we should not put roadblocks in the path of our police officers and open the gates for subversives, saboteurs and espionage agents.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is where I differ with the Senator from Idaho. . . I believe the security of our country can be very well protected without such a practice. . . I do not believe anyone should be allowed to tap wires, even with the consent of a judge. . .

Mr. WELKER. How, on God's green earth, could an innocent man object to his wire being tapped if, in fact, J. Edgar Hoover felt that the man was a subversive?

Mr. MORSE. I may say most respectfully, in the vein of two lawyers disagreeing, that I think it is highly non-sequitur argument on the whole issue of protecting the privacy of Americans to say, 'If you do not have anything to hide, what objection do you have to giving up your privacy?' . . .

The privacy of the home, which is the castle of a free man, is so precious to freedom, that I do not believe any American ought to be forced by law to give it up simply on the basis of the argument, 'What do you have to hide?' The answer to the argument is, 'Nothing; but what I want to preserve is my right to complete privacy.' . . .

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from this discussion I think it can be seen that there will be differences upon methods of handling the situation, but I certainly believe, so far as I am concerned, that wiretapping should be prohibited in any form.

When this is done we will begin to restore a measure of freedom to a people encircled by fear and hysteria. We will begin the task of making more secure all the protective provisions of our Bill of Rights. We will begin the work—so long neglected—of protecting the individual in the rights he has won through the struggle of the centuries. We can then proclaim freely to the world: 'Others may lose their individual rights but we intend to preserve ours.'

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name_____

Street_____

City_____ **Zone**_____ **State**_____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name_____

Street_____

City_____ **Zone**_____ **State**_____

6-28-54

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED